

My perspective on this is fairly simple but I think it has some merit. So Comcast is examining only a subset of the data on their network, specifically peer-to-peer. Comcast is an internet service provider and as such, they should have no concern over the traffic on their network. If Comcast intends to prevent only this set of data on their network, then they are claiming to have responsibility over all content sent over the network. This would also include child pornography and logically, they would be aiding and abetting in the distribution. Either Comcast is responsible for all traffic on their network or none of it – similar to common carrier status. Besides, there are allegations of Comcast forging packets of data and pretending to be the other side. This is also unacceptable.

I feel that their move to reduce peer-to-peer traffic is due a lack of bandwidth capability on their parts. Comcast advertises unlimited bandwidth and therefore users should be able to hold them to their agreement. From what I've heard, many telcos received tax breaks in the later 90s to develop and enhance their network bandwidth. Unfortunately it sounds like that instead, these companies pocketed the money and kept business as usual. Customers should not be punished for the failings of industry.

In many places, Comcast (and other cable companies) may be the only high speed provider as DSL is not always available. Until competing services such as Verizon FIOS can reach out, many users are stuck with this level of service. I don't like the idea of making an example out of them but a hefty fine and requiring them to publish their bandwidth caps may mitigate much of this down the road. Additionally, supporting network neutrality would also prevent similar problems down the road.

Thanks for looking into this issue.